

24 MAY 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration

FROM : F. W. M. Janney  
Director of Personnel

SUBJECT : Annual Personnel Plan

STATINTL

REFERENCE : Memo for DD/A fr [redacted]  
Chairman, Personnel Study Group, not  
dtd, same subj.

STATINTL

1. We have seen a copy of the memorandum submitted to you by the DDA Planning Conference Study Group chaired by [redacted] on the subject of the APP, and believe it appropriate to provide you with our comments on the subject. The Study Group highlights and supports a number of our observations and/or concerns. We concur with the Group that there is a serious lack of feedback from top management to the offices regarding their APP submissions and the purposes they serve at the Directorate and Agency levels. From our discussions with officers in the Midcareer Courses and Management Seminars, etc., we find little evidence those officers have been made aware of the APP or its use for Directorate and Agency purposes. We also support the Study Group's concern that Directorate management should establish objectives or goals within which the Subgroups can complete and implement their personnel plans. Another real concern is the cursory review Office Heads apparently give the APP.

2. We have attached a list of items relative to the APP which we believe should be discussed before the next cycle. The comments present a pattern of indicators which reflect a substantive lack of understanding or appreciation of the Agency's personnel management system. Our experience is that the problems derive in part from the resistance to new techniques by some managers and in part from insufficient Career Service direction, evaluation of input or feedback to the Subgroups. With an increase of active participation of senior management at both the Office and Directorate level, and a required accountability, we

# ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R001000060015-3

believe many of the problems listed will disappear. This is not to say that all offices now fail in their concern; we find many senior managers are responsibly involved, however not enough are concerned in the review or goal setting. One specific area for increased participation at the Career Service level could be a requirement to relate APP plans to the budgetary processes, or vice versa, but at least to have each aware of the other.

3. It may be worthwhile to ask if the APP is achieving its purpose, i.e., to focus the attention of management on key areas of personnel management concern. We believe it is, and to a greater degree than casual conversation or comments would indicate. Too much attention has been given to complaints having to do with the technical aspects rather than to the plans which result in the statistics or to the analysis of the data presented. Given solid senior management understanding, support and guidance with appropriate follow-up, including the requirement for accountability, the APP will become a major tool in effective personnel management. The former DCI gave it five years to become an accepted and effective system. We have now completed three years in the face of considerable opposition and feet dragging.

4. During the Management Committee's reviews of the APP, the greatest reaction has been in the discussions of the Career Service comparative statistics . . . not specifically that one did better or worse than another . . . but expressed by offering explanations of the respective Career Service data. This same review approach was recommended for the analysis and discussion of individual Career Service reports, and for FY 75 and FY 76 the Review Staff prepared some ten Subgroup comparative charts for each Career Service as a first step. Insofar as we can ascertain, in two Services neither the Agency report, the Career Service comparative charts nor the Subgroup analysis went beyond the Deputy Director concerned, until or unless requested by the senior Personnel Officers. In the other two, the reports were sent to the Personnel Officer but only the DDO had comment and instruction for action (in the Fitness Report rating area). The Subgroup comparative charts appear to be only material for filing as we find none went beyond the senior Personnel Officer files. We are unable to determine if the consolidated reports were discussed with senior managers, but given the track record, it is doubtful.

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

5. Despite the lack of feedback, specific or ephemeral, and with all its apparent faults and the resistance to it, we feel the APP has focused attention in a number of areas with successful results. Among these are:

EEO

Promotion rate of women above GS-13 has improved. While the hiring of Blacks has an EEO office behind it, the whole picture of employment and promotion in the APP serves to bolster the drive and support for the program. Reflects the overall improvement in a way the Affirmative Action Plan does not.

Rotational Assignments

Both inter and intra have increased each year.

Fitness Reports

Excessive use of Strong rating is being attacked in DDO, DDI, OP and hopefully the example will be followed in other Directorates and Career Subgroups.

Clerical Recruitment

This was an early success. Identification of the high percentage of stenographers using their shorthand less than two hours per week changed the mix in clerical recruitment for typists and stenos . . . saving money as well as secretarial frustration.

Training

In spring 1975, OTR for the first time in years required advance plans from all components. (Result of comparative study in FY 75 of APP goals and achievements compared to OTR capability.)

PRA

While somewhat defensive, we find the interim PRA report just completed shows significant improvement in at least a planning cycle whereas previous reports failed to reflect much if any planning.

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R0004000060015-3

Worthy of note is a comment from one officer that conversions (clerical to professional) were being given more careful review these days at the request of the DCI, without the individual relating the DCI's concern to the APP reports on this subject. Granted many of these problem areas could be easily identified without the APP, but the APP provides the mirror in which the Career Services and Subgroups can see themselves, either individually or in comparison with others. It is their report and they are responsible for what it says - a far more effective approach to problem solving than the Office of Personnel simply presenting the problem to the Office Head.

6. We find in discussions with office representatives that they differ widely in what parts of the APP are found to be the most helpful . . . one finds the gross statistics on pages 1-4 more useful (missing the point that the other sections provide the backup details herein) while others claim the specific charts are useful, but not the grosses. Whatever aspects they find of assistance in their personnel management, the APP has contributed to the process by requiring planning. The report of achievements, which is the evaluative process, is a subtle push to establishing realistic and valid goals. We firmly believe the APP (and the PDP) have been the impetus for the broadening interest within the Agency in personnel management, albeit the interest is not always expressed in these ritualistic or buzz word terms. Additional benefits are derived from the APP reports by using the data therein to respond to employee complaints that "nothing ever happens." The Career Service reports of promotions, rotational tours, EEO development, advancement of women past GS-13, conversions to professional status, training enrollments, et al can be effectively used at all levels to improve employee relations.

7. In addition to the above items of perhaps parochial interest, the APP has been used for overall Agency reporting to OMB, the Congressional investigating committees (the DCI took the reports to the Hill with him) and will undoubtedly serve as key documents in any possible GAO or Civil Service Commission review of Agency personnel management. We believe continued use of this advance planning approach to personnel management provides for gradual adapting to the technique, and conscious or unconscious adoption of this philosophy instead of ad hoc reaction. While not immediately

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R0004000060015-3

pertinent, there have been indications at various Civil Service Commission meetings that there is serious interest in establishing the technique of annual personnel planning throughout the government agencies. Our use of the APP techniques may well put the Agency in the fore of new personnel management approaches in Government.

8. To repeat what we noted above, only the active concern of each layer of managers will make the system truly effective. The APP is not designed nor expected to be as useful to the lowest level of planners whose viewpoint is usually limited to only their own situation, as it is to the Career Service level where it provides an overview of Directorate personnel management with the opportunity for recognizing the strong and identifying the weak areas of management as well as of managers. The lower levels of management will appreciate its value, however, if there is Career Service guidance for and comment on the goals, and if the Office Head is held accountable for reaching those goals, for realistic estimates and for making plans and taking action to solve the identified problems.

(Signed) F. W. M. Janney

F. W. M. Janney

Att.

Distribution:

Orig + 1 - Adse, w/att  
1 - D/Pers, w/att  
1 - OP/RS, w/att

OP/P&C/RS/[ ]:1rm (7 May 76)

# ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R001000060015-3

## OP/Review Staff Comments

Those preparing the APP look at it as a statistical report, not as a PLANNING DOCUMENT.

Too much input made at too low a level.

No Directorate initiation of policy prior to establishing the new goals.

No Directorate analysis of Office input or Directorate consolidation.

No feedback to Office Directors and Division Chiefs or Admin/Pers Officers.

No apparent accountability for implementing the plan or for reaction to its data.

Failure to relate data to what causes the data, i.e., lack of understanding of what numbers or statistics represent.

Inability to understand or have a common concept of definitions, i.e., rotational assignments.

Failure to see relationship between APP and PDP, or failure to see personnel management as a whole package.

Failure to see how the APP is used as an Agency report and plan - fail to see its contribution to Agency reports.

Sloppy preparation due partly to a failure to recognize relationship of one page to another and last year's report to this year's report, i.e., at least 30% of the report is directly transferred, line for line and number for number, from either last year's report or elsewhere in the current report, with another 30% obtained from computer runs. Only one-third requires actual planning, albeit should be related to previous experience and future expectations.

## From the Planning Team Conference

Use among the Offices is not uniform.

Violates MBO as there is negligible feedback to providing officers.



\*Failure to recognize capacity to control influencing factors.

Prepared at too low a level and inadequate review by Office Heads.

Not used for control purposes.

Conclusions or decisions not communicated to the Offices.

\*Failure to see benefit of standard reporting format.

Agency management has not established APP uses or objectives.

\*Failure to see relevance to management decision.

No mechanism for review from a policy standpoint.

\* Our conclusions from their statements.